REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 23-26 are pending in this application. Further reconsideration is requested based on the following remarks.

Response to Arguments:

The Applicants appreciate the consideration given to their arguments. The Applicants, however, are disappointed that their arguments were not found to be persuasive. The final Office Action asserts in section 12, at page 13, that:

> The term "ohmically coupled" has a specific meaning and does not mean "connected electrically directly". See, for example, Ruzyllo (Semiconductor Glossary, entry for "ohmic contact") which teaches that an ohmic coupling has resistance that is independent of applied voltage (as set forth in Ohm's law).

The definition of "Ohmic contact" of Ruzyllo provided with the final Office Action is a definition of Ohmic *contact*, not Ohmic coupling. Although coupling can include contact, contact is not coupling.

"Contact", rather, implies a physical contact. Coupling, on the other hand, can include capacitive or inductive coupling, as in a condenser or a transformer, in which there is no *physical* contact. Field effect, for example, is not a contact. Accordingly, "contact" is narrower than "coupling" because two components can be "capacitively coupled" but never "capacitively contacted". Accordingly, the definition of Ohmic *contact* provided with the final Office Action is not relevant to the claimed invention.

Nor does the definition of ohmic contact in Ruzyllo teach that an ohmic coupling has resistance that is independent of applied voltage, contrary to the assertion in the final Office Action. The definition in Ruzyllo, rather, applies to Ohmic *contact*, not Ohmic coupling, as discussed above.

The final Office Action goes on to assert in section 12, at page 13, that:

> Furthermore, the Applicant's own specification directly contradicts that that the organo-resistive material is ohmically coupled to the electrolyte. Rather, the specification clearly teaches that the organo-resistive material is not ohmically coupled to the electrolyte but rather the resistance (conductivity) changes as a result of the voltage applied. See the statements of "the resistance (and with it the conductivity) is in this case altered by several orders of magnitude" (Page 2, Lines 19-20) and more specifically "applying an electrical voltage between 2 and 3 initiates an ionic current through 4, whereby organo-resistive material 2 is either

> oxidized or reduced and is thus rendered conductive or non-conductive" (Page 5, Lines 8-11).

There is nothing contradictory about ohmic coupling and the resistance of an organo-resistive material varying in accordance with an applied voltage. Ohms law, in particular, describes resistance, not coupling. Electrically direct connected parts can be "ohmically coupled," whether resistance is linear or not. No representation is made that referring to an electrical connection as "ohmically coupled" implies adherence to Ohms law, contrary to the implication in the final Office Action.

Resistance, moreover, can be independent of applied voltage even according to Ohm's law, contrary to the assertion in the final Office Action. Under Ohm's law, rather, voltage is proportional to current, and the constant of proportionality is resistance.

The final Office Action goes on to assert in section 13, at page 14, that:

> The self-assembled monolayer (which is the organo-resistive material) is on an electrode 2000 Angstroms high, with a PDMS well enclosing the SAM covered electrode and embedded in the electrolyte (see Section Band Electrodes on Page 4032, for example or Lines 1-9 of Right Col., on Page 4032).

This is submitted to be incorrect. The section entitled "Band Electrodes" in the left column at Page 4032 of Roth-Langmuir, to the contrary, describes an electrochemical cell defined by placing a patterned 2 mm thick sheet of polymerized PDMS it to frame a ~10 mm square area encompassing both the working and counter electrodes. Consequently, the PDMS defines the area of electrode that will be exposed to an electrolyte solution, rather than an "organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in, for example, claim 1.

Lines 1-9 of the right column of page 4032, for their part, discuss "Fluorescence Imaging," rather than an "organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in, for example, claim 1.

The final Office Action goes on to assert in section 13, at page 15, that:

> As already noted, the self-assembled monolayer (SAM) is the organo-resistive material and since the electrode has the SAM thereon when exposed to the electrolyte. Therefore, Roth clearly teaches the claimed invention.

Even if this were true, however, it would still not amount to an "organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in, for example, claim 1.

The final Office Action goes on to assert in section 14, at page 15, that:

> The examiner notes that the Applicant's citation of Page 2360, Left Col., Lines 7-11 of Section II, Experiment is not relevant to the rejection.

To the contrary, according to MPEP 2131:

> The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an ipsissimis verbis test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Claim 1, for example, is directed to a memory unit. Since the citation of Roth-J. Vac at page 2360, in the left column, in lines 7-11 of Section II, "Experiment", tends to show that the elements Roth-J. Vac are not arranged as required by the claim, the citation is clearly relevant to the rejection.

The final Office Action goes on to assert in section 15, at page 16, that:

> This is not persuasive. The Applicant's position relies upon a different use for the claimed device than the prior art intends to use the device for. In response the Examiner notes that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. See, e.g., In re Pearson, 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA); In re Minks, 169 USPQ 120 (Bd Appeals); In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

This is submitted to be incorrect. Claim 1, for example, is directed to a memory unit having a storage function. Sakurai, on the other hand, is directed to a solar cell. The difference between a solar cell and a memory unit is submitted to be a structural difference. As provided in MPEP 2131:

> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Since Sakurai shows no memory unit, claim 1, for example, is not anticipated by Sakurai. *Verdegaal Bros.*

The final Office Action goes on to assert in section 16, at page 18, that:

> This is not persuasive. The Applicant's position relies upon a different use for the claimed device than the prior art intends to use the device for. In response the Examiner notes that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in

> order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. See, e.g., In re Pearson, 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA); In re Minks, 169 USPQ 120 (Bd Appeals); In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). See MPEP § 2114.

This is submitted to be incorrect. Claim 1, for example, is directed to a memory unit having a storage function. Sakurai, on the other hand, is directed to a solar cell. The difference between a solar cell and a memory unit is submitted to be a structural difference. As provided in MPEP 2143.03:

> To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Since Sakurai shows no memory unit, claim 1, for example, is patentable over Sakurai. *In re Royka*. Further reconsideration is thus requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The final Office Action asserts in section 3, at page 2, that:

> In fact, the specification teaches that the electrolyte is <u>not ohmically coupled</u> to the organo-resistive material since this device does not follow ohms law (V=IR).

To the contrary, the term "ohmically coupled" means connected electrically directly. Whether or not the organo-resistive material follows Ohms law or not is not relevant to whether the organo-resistive material is ohmically coupled to the electrolyte or not.

The definition of "Ohmic contact" of Ruzyllo provided with the final Office Action, moreover, is a definition of Ohmic *contact*, not Ohmic coupling. Although coupling can include contact, contact is not coupling.

"Contact", rather, implies a physical contact. Coupling, on the other hand, can include capacitive or inductive coupling, as in a condenser or a transformer, in which there is no *physical* contact. Field effect, for example, is not a contact. Accordingly, "contact" is narrower than "coupling" because two components can be "capacitively coupled" but never "capacitively contacted". Accordingly, the definition of Ohmic *contact* provided with the final Office Action is not relevant to the claimed invention.

Nor does the definition of ohmic contact in Ruzyllo teach that an ohmic coupling has resistance that is independent of applied voltage, contrary to the assertion in the final Office Action. The definition in Ruzyllo, rather, applies to Ohmic *contact*, not Ohmic coupling, as discussed above.

Claims 23 and 25 are submitted to comply with the written description requirement within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23 and 25 is earnestly solicited.

Enablement:

Claims 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The rejection is traversed.

Ohms law describes resistance. Electrically direct connected parts are "ohmically coupled," whether resistance is linear or not. No representation is made that referring to an electrical connection as "ohmically coupled" implies adherence to Ohms law, contrary to the implication in the final Office Action.

The final Office Action asserts in section 5, at pages 3 and 4, that:

> However, the specification teaches that the electrolyte is not ohmically coupled to the organo-resistive material since this device does not follow Ohm's law (V=IR). Rather, the specification clearly teaches that "the resistance (and with it the conductivity) is in this case altered by several orders of magnitude" (Page 2, Lines 19-20) and more specifically teaches "applying an electrical voltage between 2 and 3 initiates an ionic current through 4, whereby organo-resistive material 2 is either oxidized or reduced and is thus rendered conductive or non-conductive" (Page 5, Lines 8-11). The specification specifically teaches that the organo-resistive material is not ohmically coupled to the electrolyte but rather the resistance (conductivity) changes as a result of the voltage applied. As such, the recitation of "an organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear how the organo-resistive material can be ohmically coupled to the electrolyte.

This is submitted to be incorrect. The term "ohmically coupled" means connected electrically directly, as discussed above. Whether or not the organo-resistive material follows Ohms law or not is not relevant to whether the organo-resistive material is ohmically coupled to the electrolyte or not. Claims 23 and 25 are submitted to be definite within the meaning of 35

U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23 and 25 is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Roth, "Characterization of Charge Storage in Redox-Active Self Assembled Monolayers," Langmuir 2002, 18, 4030-4040 ((hereinafter "Roth-Langmuir"). The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Claim 1 recites:

An organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit.

Roth-Langmuir neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1. Roth-Langmuir, rather, describes a self-assembled *monolayer* formed on the surface of an *electrode*, which is then exposed to an electrolyte solution, not "an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte," contrary to the assertion in the final Office Action. In particular, as described at page 4032, in the left column, lines 3-7:

> The SAMs were formed by placing the electrode in a 2 mg/mL solution of $C_{12}Fc$, PM1, or PM3 for 20 min and sonicating for an additional 1 min.

Roth-Langmuir, moreover, exposes the *electrode* to the electrolyte solution, not an organo-resistive material. In particular, as also described at page 4032, in the left column, lines 32-35:

> PDMS adheres well to glass surfaces and prevents leakage of solution, thereby defining the area of electrode that will be exposed to electrolyte solution.

Since Roth-Langmuir places an electrode in a solution including an organo-resistive material to form a self-assembled *monolayer* on the surface of the electrode, and then exposes the *electrode* to an electrolyte solution, Roth-Langmuir has no "organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 13 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 13 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 13 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 25 and 26:

The third clause of claim 25 recites:

> An organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte to form the memory unit.

Roth-Langmuir neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 25 is the submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 26 depends from claim 25 and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 26 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26 is earnestly solicited.

Roth-J. Vac.:

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Roth et al. "Molecular Approach toward Information Storage Based on the Redox Properties of Porphyrins in Self-Assembled Monolayers," J. Vac. Sci. Technol. Pp2359-2364 (hereinafter "Roth-J. Vac."). The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Roth-J. Vac. neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1. Roth-J. Vac, rather, immerses the microelectrode in the electrolyte to *form* the self-assembled monolayers. In particular, as described at page 2360, in the left column, in lines 7-11 of Section II, "Experiment":

> The self-assembled monolayers (SAMs) of the porphyrins were formed by immersing the microelectrode in a 2 mg/milliliter solution of porphyrins for 20 min and sonic hating for an additional 1 min.

Since Roth-J. Vac. immerses the microelectrode in the electrolyte to form the self-assembled polymers, Roth-J. Vac. shows no "organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1.

Roth-J. Vac., in fact, *removes* the microelectrode from the electrolyte. In particular, In particular, as described at page 2360, in the left column, in lines 11 and 12 of Section II, "Experiment":

> The microelectrode was removed and rinsed with distilled CH_2CL_2.

Since Roth-J. Vac. removes the microelectrode from the electrolyte, Roth-J. Vac. shows no "organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1.

Roth-J. Vac., finally, leaves only a thin *film* of electrolyte on the electrode. In particular, as described in the right column at page 2360, in the label of Fig. 2:

> Cyclic staircase voltammetry (100 V s^{-1}) of the PM0 SAM on a 25 μm diam Au electrode in a film of an electrolyte solution containing 0.10 M Bu_4NPF_6 in dried, distilled CH_2CL_2 using a Ag wire counter electrode.

Since Roth-J. Vac. leaves only a thin film of electrolyte on the electrode, Roth-J. Vac. shows no "organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 13 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 13 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 13 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 25 and 26:

Roth-J. Vac. neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 25 is the submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 26 depends from claim 25 and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 26 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26 is earnestly solicited.

US Patent No. 6,447,879 to Sakurai et al.

Claims 1-6, 9-14 and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by US Patent No. 6,447,879 to Sakurai et al. (hereinafter "Sakurai "). The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Sakurai neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1. Sakurai, in fact, mentions no organo-resistive material at all, let alone a memory unit, contrary to the assertions in the final

Office Action. Sakurai, rather, describes an organic solar cell, as described at column 17, lines 38-43:

> As shown in FIG. 5, this organic solar cell has a stacked structure including a Nesa glass substrate 1, a p-type polypyrrole film 2, an Mg phthalocyanine coating layer (not shown), and an aluminum electrode 4 formed on the Mg phthalocyanine coating layer via an aqueous electrolyte solution layer 3 containing phosphate hexafluoride.

Since Sakurai describes an organic solar cell, Sakurai has no use for "an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1.

In Sakurai, moreover, an aluminum electrode 4 is *formed* on the Mg phthalocyanine coating layer via an aqueous electrolyte solution, instead of an "organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1.

Dendritic structure 13, moreover, is a dendritic structure, not an organo-resistive material, contrary to the assertion in the final Office Action. In particular, as described at column 17, lines 43-47:

> The surface of the p-type polypyrrole film 2 on the side of the aqueous electrolyte solution layer has dendritic structures 13 of a few μm high.

Since dendritic structure 13 is a dendritic structure, Sakurai describes no "organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1.

Pyramidal projections 14, moreover, are pyramidal projections, not an organo-resistive material, contrary to the assertion in the final Office Action. In particular, as described at column 18, lines 45-49:

> The surface of the p-type polypyrrole film 2 on the side of the aqueous electrolyte solution layer has a plurality of pyramidal projections 14 of 10 μm high having myriad micropores.

Since pyramidal projections 14 are pyramidal projections, Sakurai describes no "organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-6 and 9-14 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 2-6 and 9-14 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-6 and 9-14 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 25 and 26:

Sakurai neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 25 is the submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 26 depends from claim 25 and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 26 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26 is earnestly solicited.

US Patent No. 6,958,270 to Misra et al.

Claims 1-14 and 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by US Patent No. 6,958,270 to Misra et al. (hereinafter "Misra "). The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Misra neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1. Misra, in fact, mentions no memory unit at all. Misra, rather, is fabricating crossbar array microelectronic electrochemical cells, and so has no use for "an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1.

Misra, moreover, mentions no organo-resistive material at all, contrary to the assertion in the final Office Action. Misra, rather, describes polyaniline as intrinsically *conducting*, not resistive, let alone organo-resistive. In particular, as described at column 4, lines 36, 37, and 38:

> Conductive polymers are well known to those of skill in the art, for example, a commercially available intrinsically conducting polymer is Polyaniline (PAni) (ORMECON™).

Since Misra describes polyaniline as intrinsically conducting, Misra has no "organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-14 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 2-14 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-14 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 23 and 24:

The fourth clause of claim 23 recites:

An organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte to form the memory unit.

Misra neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 23 is the submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 24 depends from claim 23 and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 24 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 25 and 26:

Misra neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 25 is the submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 26 depends from claim 25 and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 26 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26 is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 5, 10, 11, 14, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth-J. Vac. The rejection is traversed to the extent it would apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Claims 5, 10, 11, and 14 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Roth-J. Vac. neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Roth-J. Vac were modified as proposed in the final Office Action, none of claims 5, 10, 11, or 14 would result. Claims 5, 10, 11, and 14 are thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 10, 11, and 14 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 23 and 24:

Roth-J. Vac. neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an organo-resistive material ohmically coupled to the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as discussed above with respect to

the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Roth-J. Vac. Were modified as proposed in the final Office Action, claim 23 would not result. Claim 23 is the submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 24 depends from claim 23 and adds further distinguishing elements. Claim 24 is thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 7 and 8:

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth-J. Vac in view of US Patent No. 6,908,536 to Beckmann (hereinafter "Beckmann"). The rejection is traversed to the extent it would apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Roth-J. Vac. neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an organo-resistive material embedded in the electrolyte to form the memory unit," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Beckman does not either. Beckman, in fact, mentions no organo-resistive material at all. Thus, even if Roth-J. Vac and Beckmann were combined as proposed in the final Office Action, neither of claims 7 or 8 would result. Claims 7 and 8 are thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 8 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1-14 and 23-26 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 1-14 and 23-26 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 9, 2010

By: /Thomas E. McKiernan/
Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501